



Analysis from PUC analyst on SB 272

Eddie Stern <estern@cosea.org>

Thu, Apr 18, 2013 at 10:00 AM

To: Gail Schwartz <gail.schwartz.senate@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Camp - DORA, Gene** <gene.camp@state.co.us>

Date: Wed, Apr 17, 2013 at 4:47 PM

Subject: Re: SB 272 - DSM Bill - question

To: Edward Stern <estern@cosea.org>

Edward,

I would agree that there is nothing in the strike-below of the bill that would require or force Xcel to increase rates. Regarding additional costs that a utility may incur as a result of the strike-below, the only costs that immediately come to mind are the studies and administrative costs associated with reconfiguring the programs. Ultimately, all costs for the program will be collected from customers.

With regard to using existing funds, that is possible. The funds are collected through what we refer to as a tracker type rider. If the Utility has uncommitted DSM funds, it is possible that these funds could be used for new studies or administrative costs. The amounts collected are periodically adjusted to account for either over or under recovery relative to assure that customers pay actual costs.

Gene

Gene Camp
Energy Section Chief

**Colorado Department of
Regulatory Agencies**
Public Utilities Commission
Energy Section
1560 Broadway, Suite 250
Denver, CO 80202
P 303.894.2047 | F 303.894.2813
www.dora.state.co.us

Please note that my email has changed to **gene.camp@state.co.us**

On Wed, Apr 17, 2013 at 4:04 PM, Edward Stern <estern@cosea.org> wrote:

Thank you very much Gene. Just to make sure I'm clear, is it accurate to say that the strike below to Senate Bill 272 will not require or force Xcel to increase rates? Is it accurate to say that the only costs that might be passed on to Xcel customers would be those incurred by the administration of the program or by any studies